

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Rosemary Espinal	Team: Team # 2	CCRB Case #: 201008517	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Friday, 06/18/2010 9:25 PM	Location of Incident: River Avenue and East 161st Street	Precinct: 44	18 Mo. SOL 12/18/2011	EO SOL 12/18/2011	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 06/18/2010 12:26 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 06/23/2010 2:09 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Neils Veras	13791	929306	032 PCT
2. POM Kandou Worley	07044	945113	032 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Brian Worthington	20109	935990	105 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Kandou Worley	Force: PO Kandou Worley used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
B.POM Neils Veras	Force: PO Neils Veras used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

§ 87(2)(b) called the Internal Affairs Bureau on June 18, 2010 to file a complaint (IAB log # 10-31072). His complaint was then forwarded to the CCRB on June 23, 2010. On June 18, 2010, at approximately 9:25 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and his wife, § 87(2)(b) were at Yankee Stadium and got into an argument with an employee. PO Brian Worthington arrested § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). PO Kandou Worly pulled § 87(2)(b)'s handcuff tight causing a contusion to the wrist and an injury to his shoulder (**Allegation A**). PO Neils Veras slammed § 87(2)(b) into a wall and she sustained a contusion on her head (**Allegation B**). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) received summonses for § 87(2)(b) issued by PO Worley and PO Veras.

On June 24, 2010, the undersigned investigator placed a call to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and received a continual ring. The same day, the undersigned mailed please call letters to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and the letters were not returned to the CCRB. On June 29, 2010, the undersigned placed a call to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and received an automated message stating that the customer was not accepting calls. The same day, the undersigned mailed final call letters to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and the letters were not returned to the CCRB. On July 1, 2010 and July 6, 2010, the undersigned placed two calls to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) stated that he would speak with his lawyer first before scheduling an appointment. On July 8, 2010, § 87(2)(b), an attorney for § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB and stated they wanted to pursue the case and requested that accommodations be made for his clients given that they live on Long Island. § 87(2)(b) was told that a notarized statement can be obtained from his clients. § 87(2)(b) then said he would speak with his clients in regard to whether they would come down to the CCRB. On July 5, 2010, the undersigned placed a call to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) who stated he has not spoken to his lawyer. On July 20, 2010, § 87(2)(b) called and requested that the undersigned not contact his clients and that all communications be done through him. The undersigned advised him that the CCRB would close the case if they did not schedule an appointment. § 87(2)(b) requested that the case remain open for a month until he could provide a date for a statement. Supervisor Jessica Pena informed § 87(2)(b) that the case would remain open until August 20, 2010 and that if no appointment was scheduled by that date, the case would be closed. To date, neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) have called the CCRB to pursue their complaint. A search of the Department of Correction inmate lookup service website confirmed that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) are not incarcerated. § 87(2)(g)

Team: _____

:

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Supervisor: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date
